

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address COMMISSENDER FOR PATENTS PO Box 1430 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.upote.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/554,219	10/24/2005	Junta Yamamichi	03500.103121.	8285
5314 7530 044022009 FTTZPATRICK CELLA HARPER & SCINTO 30 ROCKEFELLER PLAZA NEW YORK, NY 10112			EXAMINER	
			HANDY, DWAYNE K	
			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			1797	
			MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
			04/02/2009	PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Application No. Applicant(s) 10/554,219 YAMAMICHI, JUNTA Office Action Summary Examiner Art Unit DWAYNE K. HANDY 1797 -- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --Period for Reply A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS. WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION. - Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication. If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication - Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b). Status 1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on 28 January 2009. 2a) This action is FINAL. 2b) This action is non-final. 3) Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under Ex parte Quayle, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213. Disposition of Claims 4) Claim(s) 7.12 and 13 is/are pending in the application. 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration. 5) Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed. 6) Claim(s) 7, 12 and 13 is/are rejected. 7) Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to. 8) Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement. Application Papers 9) The specification is objected to by the Examiner. 10) The drawing(s) filed on is/are; a) accepted or b) objected to by the Examiner. Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abevance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a). Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d). 11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152. Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119 12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f). a) All b) Some * c) None of: Certified copies of the priority documents have been received. 2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)). * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received. Attachment(s) 1) Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) 4) Interview Summary (PTO-413)

Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)

3) Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTC/G5/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date ______

Paper No(s)/Mail Date.

6) Other:

Notice of Informal Patent Application

Application/Control Number: 10/554,219 Page 2

Art Unit: 1797

DETAILED ACTION

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

 The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless -

(b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

- The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:
 - (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

The factual inquiries set forth in *Graham* v. *John Deere Co.*, 383 U.S. 1, 148 USPQ 459 (1966), that are applied for establishing a background for determining obviousness under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) are summarized as follows:

- Determining the scope and contents of the prior art.
- Ascertaining the differences between the prior art and the claims at issue.
- 3. Resolving the level of ordinary skill in the pertinent art.
- Considering objective evidence present in the application indicating obviousness or nonobviousness.
- 3. Claims 7, 12 and 13 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as anticipated by or, in the alternative, under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as obvious over Weigl et al. (6,454,945). This rejection was originally applied as a 102 rejection in Paragraph 3 of the previous Office

Application/Control Number: 10/554,219 Page 3

Art Unit: 1797

Action (mailed 10/03/08). It remains in effect. Please see Response to Arguments below for an explanation of the current rejection.

Response to Arguments

4. Applicant's arguments filed 01/05/09 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive. Applicant has amended claim 7 to recite using the same label at both the first and second trapping portions with the first and second trapping portions being teaches the use of different reporter molecules on the beads. The Examiner respectfully disagrees and notes that the passage cited from Weigl states "the beads can be tagged with different reporter molecules". The Examiner submits that the each bead may also contain the same reporter molecules since the passage from column 36 contains additional teachings. Earlier in column 36, Weigl teaches that the plurality of reporter beads can be used to detect a variety of analytes. Then Weigl states "Each reporter bead comprises a substrate bead having a plurality of at least one type of fluorescent reporter molecules immobilized thereon. Plurality as used herein refers to more than one." The Examiner submits that this is a teaching of each reporter bead in a plurality of beads having the same type of fluorescent reporter molecule. The beads may also contain other types of fluorescent molecules as well (at least one type....). Two different beads having the same fluorescent molecules would meet the claim limitations as currently written.

Art Unit: 1797

5. In the event the passage cited by the Examiner does **not** teach a plurality of different beads each having the same reporter molecule, the Examiner then further submits that it would be obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to provide a plurality of beads having the same label. One would provide multiple beads having the same label in order to provide increased binding surface area for binding analytes in the sample. Multiple beads having the same reporter molecule would also serve to increase the label response during examination (i.e. more beads providing the same signal in response to the analyte of interest). Therefore claims 7, 12 and 13 remain rejected as being anticipated by, or obvious over. Weigl.

Conclusion

 Applicant's amendment necessitated the new ground(s) of rejection presented in this Office action. Accordingly, THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL. See MPEP § 706.07(a). Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of

Art Unit: 1797

the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the date of this final action

 Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to DWAYNE K. HANDY whose telephone number is (571)272-1259. The examiner can normally be reached on M-F 8:00-4:30.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Jill Warden can be reached on (571)-272-1267. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

/Dwayne K Handy/ Examiner, Art Unit 1797 /Jill Warden/ Supervisory Patent Examiner, Art Unit 1797

March 28, 2009